
From: Mcabee, David P [mailto:david.p.mcabee@intel.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2009 7:18 PM
To: Tecklu, Isaac
Subject: RE: App Number: 10/633,012; AD: P15447

Examiner Tecklu,

Thank you for the phone call this morning. I have prepared a suggested set of amended claims for your review, which have been attached in a word document to this email.

As we discussed, I attempted to incorporate some of dependent claim 4 in independent claim 1--"blocker logic to prevent data associated with the speculative store instruction of the speculative thread from being forwarded to a non-speculative instruction of a non-speculative thread based on a first address associated with the speculative store instruction and the first speculation identifier in comparison to a second address associated with the non-speculative store instruction and a second speculation identifier associated with the non-speculative instruction." As you can see the blocker logic prevents...based on the addresses and speculation IDs.

Independent claims 11, 21, and 34 have been amended to include similar elements. Claim 11 includes, "blocker logic to prevent data associated with a store instruction of a speculative thread from being forwarded to a non-speculative instruction of a non-speculative thread in response to a first speculation identifier associated with the store instruction not matching a second speculation identifier associated with the non-speculative instruction," Claim 21 includes, "determining if the load instruction and the in-flight store instruction each originate with a speculative thread based on a first speculation identifier associated with the in-flight store instruction and a second speculation identifier associated with the load instruction," and claim 34 includes, "a storage area to include a speculation identifier (ID) field, the speculation ID field to hold a first value to indicate an associated store instruction is associated with the speculative thread; and control logic to prevent data associated with the store instruction from being consumed by the non-speculative thread, based on the speculation ID holding the first value."

As claim 26 is directed at a more specific cache implementation, I believe it would be easier for us to cancel claims 26-33, such that I can file a continuation to handle those claims separately.

Please let me know what you think about the suggested claims. And once again, thank you for your call regarding the application.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. MCABEE

Attorney at Law

Patents and Licensing (PAL)

Intel Phone: 503-712-4988

Mail Stop: JF3-147

Email: [<mailto:david.p.mcabee@intel.com>](mailto:david.p.mcabee@intel.com)